1050 9. 32.

An Answer To M. *Cawdry's* two Books of the Sabbath, Lately come forth.

Wherein the Author doth two things: 1. He vindicates himselfe from Mr *Cawdrie's* unfriendly abuse of him, in fathering upon him three Texts of Scripture, and three Arguments deduced from them, to prove the perpetuity of the antient Sabbath, which the Author doth in no case own. 2. He vindicates the fourth Commandement from M. *Cawdry's* false Exposition of it.

Wherein the Author hath 1. Answered and confuted all that Mr *Cawdry* hath wrote to corrupt the sense and meaning of the Commandement. 2. He hath restored the antient, genuine, and proper sense of the Commandement: and confirmed it by sundry undeniable Arguments.

By *Theophilus Brabourne.*

Mat. 5 18, 19.

Untill heaven and earth passe away, one jot, or one tittle shall in no wise passe from the Law. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least Commandements, and shall teach men so, he shall be least in the kingdome of heaven.

London, Printed for *William Franklin*, and are to be sold at *Norwich*. 1654.

Dr D. WILLIAMS'S LIBRARY
RED CROSS STREET
LONDON.

To the Reader.

Saint Jude *exhorts us, that we ſhould* earneſtly contend for the truth, *which was* once delivered *unto the* Saints. *And the Prophet* Jeremiah *complaines of men in his time, who* bent *their* tongues *like* Bows *for* lies: *but they were not* valiant *or* couragious *for the* Truth, Jer. 9. 3. *If ever St* Jude's *Exhortation was needfull in the Church, it is now needfull: when the truth, or true doctrine of the Sabbath, once delivered to the Saints, is ſo ſhamefully corrupted and abuſed. If ever*

there was a time when the Prophet Jeremiah's *complaint was verified, now is the time: Do not men now, yea,* Ministers, *and of all ministers those accounted the most forward, hot, and zealous, do not these bend their tongues like bows for lies? And doth not* Mr Cawdry *appeare in the* front, *by his three books of about twelve shillings price, though to little purpose? Whether these expositions of the fourth Commandement be truths or falsities, I leave my Reader to judge, after he hath read this little Booke. They say, first, So be it we give God a day for his Sabbath, it matters not what day, be it Saturday or Sunday: As if God had never made choice of his day? They might as well say, So be it we have a man to dispense the Sacraments,*

it

it matters not what man, be he Minister or Lay-man. Secondly, They say, God did not command in his fourth Commandement the *Sabbath day, as of a certaine day definitely, but a Sabbath day, as of some uncertaine day indefinitely; as if God delivered his Commandements in* ambiguous *terms, and doubtfull words; as if no man could know by the Commandement what day God meant his people should keep for his Sabbath day. Thirdly, They say, by the ordinall word* seventh *in the fourth Commandement, we need not understand Saturday the seventh and last day of the week; but any one day of the seven, as Sunday the first day of the weeke; as if when God commanded the* last *day of the week, we may understand him of the*

first *day of the weeke. Fourthly, whereas God* rested *at the Creation on Saturday the seventh day for our* imitation; *they say, we may* imitate *Gods example if we rest on Sunday the first day; as if we imitated Gods example by* crossing *of it: for he rested at the end of the weeke, and we rest at the beginning of the weeke. Fifthly, They say, the fourth Commandement enjoyned the* Jews *to keep Saturday; & the same fourth Commandement enjoynes* Christians *to keepe Sunday; as if one and the same Commandement should enjoyne contrary things: as the Saturday, which they call* Judaisme, *and the Sunday, or Lords day, which they call their* Christian Sabbath: *and so it shall enjoyne both* Judaisme *and* Christianisme: *and so the*

fourth

fourth Commandement ſhall have one ſenſe and meaning yeſterday, and another this day: for thouſands of yeares till Chriſt it ſhall have one expoſition, as for Saturday; and for ever after Chriſt it ſhall have another expoſition, as for Sunday. Now to make up the number of ſeven abominations *Mr* Cawdry *will adde two more as theſe enſuing. Sixthly, The Sabbath day and ſeventh day, mentioned in the fourth Commandement, are not the* ſubſtance *of the fourth Commandement, but one day in ſeven is the ſubſtance: as if the words* expreſſed *in the Commandement ſhould be no ſubſtance, and yet one day in ſeven, which words are not expreſſed, ſhould be the ſubſtance of it. Seventhly, The Sabbath day*

and seventh day, mentioned in the fourth Commandement are indirectly *commanded, but one day of seven, of which there are no such words in the Commandement, and yet these are* directly *commanded, as he saith. Was there ever any of God's ten Commandements thus shattered by* Jesuites? *and thus wrung and wrested from the genuine and true sense intended by God? and yet these are the expositions given by the godly Ministers: Now may I not justly take up the Prophet* Jeremiah's *complaint of these so zealous Ministers, saying, They bend their tongues like* Bows *to publish false Expositions of Gods fourth Commandement? The Lord threatned old* Eli *the Priest, saying,* They that despise me shall be despised, 1 *Sam.* 2.30.

And

And have not these Ministers despised God by corrupting the sense of one of his ten Commandements? And hath not God of late despised them? Never did God poure greater contempt upon Clergy men than in our daies, wherein they are ashamed to weare black Coats, and turne into colours.

These things premised, now I shall give my Reader an account how far I have answered Mr Cawdry's *Books: He hath wrote three books of the Sabbath: the first part about seven yeares agone, the other two parts now lately; I do not undertake to answer all that he hath wrote, for many things he hath wrote, not against me, but in confutation of the Bishop of* Eli, *Doctor* White's *Book, which was an Answer unto my* second.

Book

Booke of the Sabbath: *and particularly againſt what I wrote in it, in maintenance of the antient Sabbath: but* granting *what I wrote againſt the* Lords day *Sabbath: And divers things he hath wrote againſt Dr* Heyline, *and againſt Maſter* Primroſe: *Now I leave theſe things unto their proper Authors: I meddle with no more than with what he hath wrote againſt me, as touching the antient Sabbath, and the Lords-day Sabbath: as touching theſe two I give this account.*

1. *As touching the antient Sabbath, I do not endeavour punctually to confute any of his Anſwers made to* divers *of my twenty foure Arguments, leſt my books ſhould be committed to the* fire, *and I ſhould offend the*

the State: yet I have much ado to bridle my ſelfe ſo as to be ſilent in this quarrell: I only endeavour to vindicate my ſelfe from Mr Cawdry's *unfriendly abuſe of me, by* fathering *upon me the things I never wrote: and to* vindicate *God's fourth Commandement from his falſe Expoſitions of it; and my hope is, that the State will permit a man to do ſo much for* God, *and for* himſelfe.

2. *As for the Lords day Sabbath, ſo called, but never ſo proved, I ſhall not here alleadge any Scriptures againſt it; nor confute any of Mr* Cawdry's replies, *made by him, to my anſwers which I made to their ſeverall Texts of Scripture alleadged for the Lords day, nor ſhall I need: for Mr* Cawdry *hath rather replied to the an-*

swers of the Bishop *of* Ely, *to Dr* Heyline, *and to Mr* Primrose, *than to my answers: and yet he hath carried it on so cunningly, as his Reader cannot but thinke he hath confuted Mr* Brabourne *also, and this must go among the Vulgar for an Answer to my Books; this is one peece of Mr* Cawdry's Sophistry: *he cannot be content to abuse me with fathering upon me falsely three Texts of* Scripture: *but also he must make the world beleeve that he hath answered my books against the* Lords-day *Sabbath, whereas he hath done no such thing: he hath indeed mentioned my name often, but never replied to my Answers: and if he hath mentioned any of them, instead of a Confutation he hath sleightly passed by, and instead thereof*

thereof he hath falne upon the Biſhop, *Dr* Heyline, *or Mr.* Primroſe; *It is uſuall with moſt that write for the* Lords day *to have a fling at Mr* Brabourne; *in one Page they among* many *things carpe at ſome one, and twenty or thirty Pages after they carpe at another; and perhaps fifty or ſixty Pages after they carpe at a third, and ſo much for confutation of M.* Brabourne; *thus have ſome done in their bookes from* New-England, *and many in their books in* Old England; *but none of them all* dare *undertake to confute all my Anſwers to their Texts: for I have given not only* one *Anſwer, but* many *Anſwers to* every *one of their Texts: So Mr* Cawdry *perhaps may ſtumble upon ſome* one *of my* many *Anſwers: but*

to go Text by Text, and confute all my Answers: answer by answer as is meete and reasonable, I have not yet seene it, nor do I beleeve that ever *I shall see it: his wit in passing these things by in silence so sleightly, is to me an Argument that he is at a* nonplus, *and therefore is faine to make a* colour *of an Answer, and to* blusker *among the people with the* wind *of three great books: so thinks*

Theoph. Brabourne.

Mr Brabourne's *vindication of himselfe from the unfriendly abuse of Mr* Cawdry, *fathering upon him no less than three Texts of Scripture, and three Arguments deduced from them, to prove the morality or perpetuity of the antient seventh-day-Saturday-Sabbath, the which things M.* Brabourne *doth in no case own.*

The words of Mr Cawdry.

SEE Mr *Cawdries* book on the Sabbath, his third part, in p. 429, 430. thus writing: *Of all that have wrote of this subject* (to wit the Sabbath day) *Mr* Brabourne *is the largest, and*

hath the greateſt ſhew of Scripture and Reaſon for his opinion: and therefore in confuting him we ſhall eaſily confute all the reſt; He hath produced five Texts of Scripture for himſelfe, we conſider their ſtrength in order. Objection the firſt out of Gen. 2. 3.

The firſt is taken from Gen. 2. 3. *whence thus he argueth: An Ordinance given in the ſtate of innocency, not peculiar to that ſtate is perpetuall. But by divine inſtitution the ſeventh day was appointed to be the time of reſt in Innocency, and not appropriated to that ſtate. Ergo.*

To this Text, and to this Argument deduced from it, I anſwer; At my firſt reading them my heart roſe againſt them, ſaying in my ſelfe, ſurely Mr *Cawdry* hath done me wrong: then I tooke my firſt booke of the Sabbath, printed 1628. and ſought among my twelve Arguments there for proofe of the perpetuity of the ancient ſeventh-day-Sabbath, but there I could not find theſe things; then I ſought in my ſecond book of the Sabbath, printed 1632. among my twenty foure Arguments for the antient Sabbath,

Sabbath, and there I could not find these things; Lastly, because I would make a through and full search, I spent some houres to turne over both my books page by page, but neither so could I find these things; wherefore I disclaime this first Text and Argument as none of mine.

Mr *Cawdry*, in charging this, and two other Texts upon me, doth not say in which of my two books the Reader might find them; nor in which of my twelve or twenty foure Arguments these things may be found, nor in what page they may be found, so the Reader is left to seek a *needle* in a bottle of *hay*; there are 238. pages in my former booke, and 632. pages in my latter booke, so it is not easie for any man to find a thing without direction, but it is too common with some Writers, in a weake cause, wittily, I might say wickedly, to omit the quotation of the booke and page, and then to foist in what they please of their owne, the easilier to deceive the Reader, to abuse the Author, and the better to gaine credit to their weake cause, by begetting a sleighty opinion of their Adversary.

The second Text.

Mr *Cawdry* in the place fore cited, and page 430. thus writeth. *Objection the second. The second place of Scripture is that of* Exod. 31. 16. *where the Sabbath is call'd (An everlasting Covenant) and therefore it is still in force.*

To this Text, and the Argument deduced from it, I answer as before, that I have sought for these things in my first booke, and in my twelve Arguments, and in my second booke, and in my twenty foure Arguments there for the seventh-day-Sabbath: for where else should I seeke but among my Arguments for this Text and Argument? But there I finde them not; yea, I have cursorily sought page by page in both my books, but yet I cannot find them; wherefore I disclaime them as none of mine.

I yet remember, that before I printed my first book I had thoughts of this Text, *Exod* 31.16. where the Sabbath is called an *Everlasting Covenant*, but I then fore-saw that I could not from these words frame a sound Argument to prove the perpetuity

petuity of the ancient Sabbath, because *Circumcision* is called an Everlasting Covenant also, wherefore I laid it aside; and will Mr *Cawdry* now father this weake Argument upon me? What can his end of it be but to render me, & the cause I have in hand, ridiculous and contemptible? To deceive his Reader? And to winne vaine applause to himselfe and his cause?

The third Text.

Mr *Cawdry* in the place first cited, and in page 430. thus writeth; *Objection the third from* Isa. 66. 23. *The third Text is* Isa. 66. 23. *where the Prophet, speaking of the renewed state of the Church by Christ, saith, from month to month, and Sabbath to Sabbath, all flesh should come to worship the Lord.* To this Text he *answereth*, that the continuance and perpetuity of the Sabbath can no more be concluded hence than of the *New Moons* which are mentioned with the Sabbath, yet by himselfe granted to be abolished.

I have sought among my twelve Arguments in one of my books, and my twenty foure Arguments in my

other booke, but cannot find any where that I alledged this text to prove the perpetuity of the seventh day-Saturday-Sabbath; wherefore I disclaime this text also as none of mine, but of Mr *Cawdry's* own devising.

As for his *answer* to it, doth Mr *Cawdry* thinke Mr *Brabourne* so rash in choosing a Text to prove the Sabbaths perpetuity, as to make choice of this text, where the *Sabbath* is not preferred above the *New Moons* for perpetuity? But Mr *Cawdry*, it seems, knew no better way to bring Mr *Brabourne* into contempt with his Reader, than to forge such shallow-brain'd things as this is, and then to father them upon Mr *Brabourne*.

Having spoken of the three texts severally, now I shall speake of them joyntly; Mr *Cawdry* placeth these his, and not mine, three texts in the *front*, before my two texts which I owne (of which too by and by) here I note his sophistry and carnall policy, hoping by the weakenesse of these three Texts, and my arguing so weakely from them, to bring me and my two texts following

ing into a weake eſtimation with his Reader, that ſo he may thinke there is no more ſtrength of Argument in my two following texts, than is in the three texts going before.

The fourth and fifth Texts.

See Mr *Cawdry* in page 431. thus writing: *Objection the fourth. The fourth is taken out of the New Teſtament,* Mat. 5. 17, 18. *where our Saviour ratifies the morall Law, the Decalogue till the end of the world; whence thus he argueth: If every jot and tittle of the Law be in force untill the worlds end, then theſe letters and words, the ſeventh day is the Sabbath, are in force untill the worlds end. But the former is true by the Text alledged* Mat. 5. 17, 18. *Ergo, &c.*

Objection the fifth. The laſt Text is Mat. 24. 20. *whence thus he argues: Their deſtruction was forty yeares after Chriſts death, yet he bids them pray that their flight might not be in the winter, nor on the Sabbath day; and therefore Chriſt foreſaw that the Sabbath day ſhould be in force ſtill, and kept after his death.*

These two texts indeed I own for mine, and the ſubſtance of the two Arguments

Arguments deduced from them, though but unhandsomly laid down by Mr *Cawdry*; now let the Reader judge whether there be not better force of proofe in these two texts than there was in the three texts set before them in the *front*, on purpose to disgrace me and these two texts.

As for the Text *Mat.* 5.17,18. I allow it as Mr *Cawdry* hath laid it downe. As for the other text, *Mat.* 24.20. *Pray that your flight be not on the Sabbath day*; this flight was to be at the destruction of *Jerusalem*, about fifty years after Christs death; whence I thus argue, that *Christ allowed* of the antient Sabbath as a *Christian* Ordinance in the Church, all times of the Gospell after his death; and had it been a dying *Ceremony*, as many fancy, Christ would not have bidden Christians to pray to God to prevent their profanation of it, for this had been a profanation of the sacred duty of Prayer; as if a Papist should pray not to travell on Christmas day.

Having by these two Texts proved the *perpetuity* of the antient seventh day, and Saturday-Sabbath, it will be

be expected by my Reader that I ſhould confute Mr *Cawdry's anſwers* to them; which thing I profeſſe I can eaſily doe without much ſtudy; but no provocations ſhall make me go beyond the bounds I have ſet to my ſelfe; I have reſolved to handle but two things: the one is to *vindicate* my ſelfe from the abuſe of the three forged Texts: the other is to *vindicate* God's fourth Commandement from Mr *Cawdry's* falſe gloſſes, and corrupt Expoſitions of it, ſaying, God commanded not the ſeventh day in *order*, but one day in the ſeven without *order*; and by this falſe Expoſition he makes his anſwer to many of my twenty foure Arguments.

My hope is that as our *State* do allow *liberty* of Conſcience to ſome in ſome caſes, ſo they will allow me a *liberty* in theſe two things: firſt, to vindicate my ſelfe from ſlanders. Secondly, to vindicate Gods fourth Commandement from falſe Expoſitions. I dare not go farther leſt I ſhould offend the *State*, and have my books burnt; one Mr *Ockford* about two yeares paſt wrote a booke

in defence of my way against the Lords day, and for the old day the seventh day, but, as saith Mr *Cawdry*, it was answered by *fire*, being ordered to be burnt; as I remember Mr *Tyndals* Translation of the New Testament long since was ordered to be burnt too; and was not *Paeus* on the *Romans* burnt also in King *James* his daies? And I feare me so it would be with this my book if I should exceed my bounds; Let not therefore Mr *Cawdry* thinke, that I do not reply to his answers because I cannot, but because I dare not; if I durst, and had but this faire dealing, to have the Presse as open to me as it is to him, he should soone see that I would make his weakness in arguing to appeare unto all men. I had rather be engaged in this quarrell than go to my dinner or supper. When two Souldiers are to fight, the odds is too great, to give al encouragements and conveniences to the one, and bind the hands of the other behind him, or hold a cudgell over his head if he strikes a blow; it is my unhappy condition to suffer this odds, to have the fire prepared

for

for my books, and the benefit of the Preſſe denied me, unleſſe I Print by ſtealth. So far for vindication of my ſelfe: and now for the vindication of the fourth Commandement.

Of the vindication of Gods fourth Commandement.

Before I fall cloſe upon this point, I ſhall premiſe five things tending to the vindication of this Commandement.

1. What may be the reaſon of Mr *Cawdry's* wreſting theſe words in the fourth Commandement; *The ſeventh day is the Sabbath*, from the proper ſenſe of the *ordinall* number ſeventh? which ſignifies not only one of ſeven, but more, as the laſt of ſeven, and that ſingle one which followes the ſixe dayes labour; and why would he inſtead of this bring in *one day of ſeven indefinitely*?

His tacite reaſon I beleeve is this, that having no *precept* for the *Lords day* in the *New* Teſtament, and none but poore probable reaſons *ab exemplo*, therefore he would faine incorporate the Lords day into the fourth Commandement to ſtrengthen it: ſo it having no legs of its

own to ſtand on, he would be ſo friendly to it, as to borrow a paire of legs from the fourth Commandement, and then it ſhall be able to ſtand in the opinion of the deluded multitude. As for his Arguments *ab exemplo*, from *example*, as is the *ſuppoſed practice* of the *Apoſtles*, however it go current in the *Pulpit*, yet Sir, if you know it not, let me informe you, that an Argument *ab exemplo* in *Diſputation* is next unto nothing, try it when you will.

For my part, if it could be proved that the *Lords day* had a *divine* inſtitution, which I never ſaw proved, nor hath Mr *Cawdry* proved it in any or all of his three larger Volumes on the Sabbath; I ſay, if it could be proved to be ſet up by Chriſt or his Apoſtles, yet I *flatly deny it* to be commanded in the fourth Commandement, for the Lords day is called in Scripture the *firſt* day of the weeke, but the fourth Commandement is for the ſeventh and *laſt* day of the weeke; and the Lords day was not *known* when the fourth Commandement was given on mount *Sinai*.

If

If, as you ſay, *Chriſt* did inſtitute the Lords day, is not Chriſts *inſtitution* and authority ſufficient for it, but that you muſt run unto the Old Teſtament, the fourth Commandement for a Law and Commandement for it? Chriſt hath inſtituted two new Sacraments, *Baptiſme* and the *Lords Supper*; now, is not Chriſts inſtitution and authority ſufficient to uphold them, but that we muſt run to the Old Teſtament as unto the Laws and Commandements for *Circumciſion* and the *Paſſeover*? ſaying, our two Sacraments ſtand by force of the two Laws in the Old Teſtament. So if Chriſt had ſet up a *third* new Ordinance, as the *Lords day*, what need we to run further than the New Teſtament, and then to *Chriſts* inſtitution and authority for it.

But you will ſay, Circumciſion and the Paſſeover are Ceremonials, but the fourth Commandement is Morall. I anſwer, if the fourth Commandement be *morall*, then the *time* there commanded is morall too: and morall things are not alterable: *one jot or tittle ſhall not paſſe from the*

Law so long as heaven and earth last, *Mat.*5.18.

/It is a signe the cause is naught, when the Authors of it are so put to their shifts, and to use their wits, as to run such strange and unusuall courses, as to run from the *New* Testament to the *Old* Testament, and that for a *new Ordinance*: yea, and also to wrest the proper sense of the fourth Commandement, as if it were a *nose* of wax, to be bowed on this side at one time, and on the other side at another time: to command the *Saturday* for thousands of years until Christ, and the *Sunday*, or Lords day for ever after Christ./

/2. I shall premise another thing, which is a *distinction* of Mr *Cawdries*, saying, in his second part, page 255. The old world had the *last* day of the weeke, the new world the *first* day of the weeke. Now by the old world he meanes the Church of the Jews before Christ, and by the new world the Christian Church since Christ; and both these have their *severall daies* from this *one* fourth Commandement; now this is a *Papists* distinction in its application: for

for Papists say of the second Commandement, that it forbade *Images* indeed to the *Jews*, that is, to the old world, but not unto *Christians*, that is, to the new world: and so saith Mr *Cawdry*, the fourth Commandement was for the *last* day of the weeke to the Jews of the old world, but it is not so to Christians of the new world, for it commands us the *first* day of the weeke; might he not as well say, Protestants are bound by the fifth Commandement to honour their *Parents*; and by the same Commandement Papists are bound to honour the *Pope*, but not their Parents? Never did Jesuites more abuse the second Commandement, than Mr *Cawdry* doth the fourth Commandement.

3. I shall premise this also; that Mr *Cawdry* saith in his second part, page 255. That the seventh day in order was not the *substance* of the fourth Commandement. In his third part, page 418. He saith, The ground of all the *Sabbatarian errour* is, that they take for granted, that the seventh-day-Saturday-Sabbath was commanded as the *substance* of the

fourth Commandement; we agree with them in this, that if it be ſo we muſt turne *Anabaptiſts*, who keep no day, or *Sabbatarians*, to keep the ſeventh day with the Jews; but this is their miſtake, *&c.* And in p. 259. of his ſecond part he ſaith, one day in ſeven is the *ſubſtance* of the fourth Commandement.

To this I anſwer, Firſt, if theſe words, *The ſeventh day is the Sabbath*, be not the ſubſtance of the fourth Commandement, how can *these* words, *one day in ſeven*, be the ſubſtance of the Commandement? Are they not both ſpoken of the *time*? If the one be the ſubſtance, then the other is a ſubſtance alſo; and if that which is not expreſſed in the Commandement, as one day in ſeven, be the ſubſtance of it, then much rather muſt theſe words, the ſeventh day, which are expreſſed in the Commandement, be the ſubſtance of the Commandement.

2. For this word *ſubſtance*, it is not uſed here *properly*; for it hath neither *Circumſtance* nor *Accident* in the fourth Commandement; the ſubſtance is the duty of *reſt* from labour,

bour, and the *worſhip* of God; the *time* is the Circumſtance. Beſides, few Readers underſtand what ſubſtance and accident are; wherefore I would require Mr *Cawdry* to forbeare this word ſubſtance, and ſtate the queſtion by ſome other word which is proper, and which every Reader may underſtand, as to uſe the word *commanded*; for we ſpeake of one of Gods Commandements, and of a day or time commanded; which alſo will avoid ſtrife betweene the diſputants about the word ſubſtance, it being liable to be uſed ſometime in one ſenſe, ſometime in another; Now, if you uſe the word commanded, then Mr *Cawdry* muſt ſay, The ſeventh day was not commanded, but one day of ſeven was commanded; both which are manifeſtly falſe: for *the ſeventh day* was expreſly commanded in ſo many words, ſaying, *The ſeventh day is the Sabbath, in it thou ſhalt not do any worke*; but *one day of ſeven* was not commanded or expreſſed in the fourth Commandement; So now *Sir*, they are your own words, you muſt turn *Anabaptiſt*, keeping no day, or

Sabbatarian, keeping the Saturday-Sabbath with the Jews, now take your choice,

4. I shall premise this also; Mr *Cawdry* saith in his second part, page 257. In *like manner* we suppose it may be said, that the fourth Commandement saith, Thou shalt sanctifie one day of seven *at Gods appointment*, that is, in particular, God appointed the last day of seven to the old world, and the first day of seven to the new world.

To this I answer; Here he makes *one day of seven* to be the *genus*, whereas those words be no where expresst in the fourth Commandement, nor are gatherable by consequence; and then he makes the *last* day of seven, the Saturday, and the *first* day of seven, the Sunday to be the two *species*; the former appointed by God to the Jews in the fourth Commandement, the latter appointed by God to Christians in or by the fourth Commandement also; but is it not strange, that

1. God should appoint two severall daies by one single Commandement, and never to expresse any more

more than *one?* For the fourth Commandement mentions but one day *singularly*, not daies *plurally*; as the Sabbath day, not daies: and the seventh day, not daies, *Exod.* 20 8, &c.

2. Is it not strange, that in one and the same Commandement, and in the very same words, God should appoint both a *Jewish* and a *Christian* Sabbath? And the one to be kept in memory of the *Creation*, the other of the *Redemption?* But such things are nothing strange to Mr *Cawdry*.

3. Is it not strange, that God should appoint to the Jews their *seventh-day-Sabbath* at the giving of the Law on mount *Sinai*, and at the same time, and in the same words, without any difference making, appoint the *Lords day* to *Christians*, a day not known then to the Jews, nor to have any being or beginning, for thousands of yeares after, till Christ came? This *Lords day* was hidden so secretly in the fourth Commandement, that had not Mr *Cawdry* stept up of late, by his more than ordinary wit and skill in Logick, to search and find it out for us in the fourth Commandement, we should never have

have thought of such a Jewell lockt up in the fourth Commandement; I marvell he hath not found also the Sacrament of *Baptisme* to be appointed by God in *Circumcision*, and secretly lockt up in the old Law for Circumcision: and our *Lords Supper* to be appointed by God for us Christians in the *Passeover*, and closely hidden in the old Law for the Passeover, and then, and *there* commanded to us; though these were ceremoniall, yet our Christian Sacraments in them might be morall or perpetuall.

4. Is it not strange, that *Law* and *Gospell* both should be comprized in *one* Commandement, and in one and the same words without any difference made by God? Did God want words that he must expresse differing things in one and the same word? had not Mr *Cawdry* found out this mystery, I must professe, I should have been deeply ignorant of it; now, the old Sabbath day was *Law*, and a part of the Law and Decalogue: and the feigned Lords day in the fourth Commandement was *Gospell*, it being kept in memory of our

our Redemption by Christ; so there was both Law and Gospell commanded by God in the fourth Commandement, according to Mr *Cawdry*; these things considered, is not Gods fourth Commandement shamefully abused by Mr *Cawdry*? and is it not high time to vindicate it?

5. I shall premise another thing; Mr *Cawdry* in his second part, page the 255,257,256,265. saith, that one day in seven is *directly* commanded in the fourth Commandement; but the seventh day is *indirectly* commanded in the fourth Commandement; now I suppose that is said to be directly which is *expressed* in words; and that indirectly which is *gathered* from the words by consequence of reason, and so Mr *Cawdry* understands it, saying in page 255. *expresly* and *directly*, both words of the same sense; and in Page 259. not directly but by consequence.

To this I answer; Is it not strange Sir, that you should say, *one day of seven* is directly commanded, when these words, one day in seven, are not to be found in the fourth Commandement? And to say these words

The seventh day, which are expreſſed, are but indirectly, and by conſequence commanded? Surely, if any thing be indirectly in the fourth Commandement it muſt be one in ſeven, becauſe theſe words are not in the Commandement. In the fifth Commandement the thing directly and expreſly commanded is, to honour our naturall Parents: but to honour Magiſtrates is indirectly, and by conſequence commanded, it not being expreſſed; why you ſhould ſo croſſe a received diſtinction ſeems a Paradox to me.

Theſe five things I have premiſed, and now I come a little cloſer to the worke, as Mr *Cawdry* leads me on: and thus he begins to defend *One day in ſeven* to be the true ſenſe and meaning of the fourth Commandement, and that it is no *paradoxall* expoſition of it.

To hold one day of ſeven is the ſenſe of the fourth Commandement is not a Paradox.

His firſt inſtance.

Mr *Cawdry* in his ſecond part, p. 257. gives for inſtance the *place* of Gods worſhip, *Deut.* 12. 5, 11. where it

it is said to this effect: *Ye shall offer all your sacrifices only in the place which the Lord shall choose*; and the place chosen by God afterward, was first the *Tabernacle*, and after it the *Temple*; now it is evident that this precept did not enjoyne them directly to offer their Sacrifices at the Tabernacle; or at the Temple, but only indirectly. *In like manner* it may be said of the *time* of Gods worship; the fourth Commandement saith, *Thou shalt sanctifie one day of seven at Gods appointment*, as the *last* day of seven to the old world, and the *first* day of seven to the new world, but neither of them directly by the fourth Commandement, but indirectly.

To this I answer. 1. These cases are not *alike*: for as touching the *place* of Gods worship, *Deut* 12. it was commanded only in *generall* or *indefinitely*, not naming any particular place; and so both Tabernacle and Temple were indirectly commanded as by consequence; but as for the *time* of Gods worship, *Exod.*20.8,&c. it was not commanded in generall or indefinitely, but

in *particular* and *definitely*, naming *the seventh day* the particular and definite time; and this is not indirectly, but directly and expresly commanded.

2. The cases are *unlike* in this, that as for the place of Gods worship, after God had indefinitely commanded it, *Deut.* 12. it was sufficiently known to be afterwards the *Tabernacle* and the *Temple*, no man questioning it; but as for the *Lords day*, or first day of the new world, considered as a Sabbath of divine institution, hath been denied by many learned and godly *Divines*, whose names and *words* I have mentioned in my second booke of the Sabbath, Pag. 264, &c. as *Peter Martyr*, *Brentius*, *Calvin*, *Zanchie*, *Ursinus*, *Pareus*, *Chemnitius*, *Dr. Prideaux*, *Zuinglius*, *Melanchton*, *Hemingius*, *Bullingius*, Mr *Tindall*, and Mr *Fryth* two godly *Martyrs* with others there named, and many more I could name, if it were needfull, all of them holding and writing that the *Lords day* is but an *indifferent* thing, and of the same authority with *Christmas day*, St *Mathews day*, and the other

Holy

Holy daies of the Church; To these I may adde that since I wrote my second booke of the Sabbath, I have seene neere twenty *books* lately printed all against the *Lords-day-Sabbath*: so it is not so cleare a case among us that the Lords day, the first day of the weeke, or the first day of the new world, is appointed by God, for the *time* of Gods worship, as it was cleare to the Jews, that the Tabernacle or Temple was appointed of God for the *place* of his worship; yea, as this day among our selves it is a controversie to know which day is the Sabbath day, the Saturday or the Sunday.

3. Whereas you say Sir, The fourth Commandement saith, *Thou shalt sanctifie one day of seven.* This is false; if no man had the ten Commandements but your selfe, you might say what you list, as you do; but being all men have them as well as your selfe, no man will beleeve you so long as they read no such words in the Commandements: or if you take it for *granted* before you have *proved* it, as here you do, that your words are the *sence* and mea-

ning of the fourth Commandement, then you do but ſophiſtically beg the queſtion.

Thus you have ſeen that this firſt inſtance proves nothing; for it ſhews not that one day of ſeven may be the ſenſe and meaning of the fourth Commandement, nor that you, Sir, are freed from a *Paradox* in ſaying the fourth Commandement enjoynes one day of ſeven.

His ſecond inſtance.

Mr *Cawdry* in page 258. thus writeth; We ſhall give light to our aſſertion by comparing the *time* of worſhip, and the worſhip it *ſelfe*: comparing the fourth Commandement with the ſecond Commandement; the ſecond Commandement doth not *directly* and expreſly command the *particular ſervices*, as Sacrifices, Circumciſion, the Paſſeover, *&c.* yet all theſe fall under the generall Obligation of the ſecond Commandement by way of *conſequence*, as *ſpeciales* to a generall: The like may be ſaid of the ſervices of the New Teſtament *Baptiſme* and the *Lords Supper*, &c. and theſe ſervices are reduced to the generall morali-

morality of the ſecond Commandement; juſt ſo (we thinke) it is in the fourth Commandement; the ſpeciall day, the ſeventh day, was not *directly* and expreſly commanded in the fourth Commandement, no, nor the Lords day, yet both fell under the Obligation of the fourth Commandement as *ſpecials* to a *generall*. To this I anſwer.

1. Suppoſing, but not granting, that Sacrifices, *&c.* Baptiſme, and the Lords Supper were commanded in the generall in the ſecond Commandement, yet the Saturday-ſeventh-day Sabbath, and the Lords day were not both commanded in the *generall* in the fourth Commandement.

As for the *Lords day* it was not *thought* on at the giving of the Law on mount *Sinai* in the wilderneſſe, how ſhould it then be commanded in the fourth Commandement? Nor can it be *underſtood* in the fourth Commandement, for this is for the day called by its proper name (as ſhall hereafter appeare) Sabbath day; *Remember the Sabbath day*, now the fourth Commandement binds to

Saturday, properly called Sabbath day, cannot bind to Sunday, or Lords day, the day following.

Againe the fourth Commandement saith, *The seventh day is the Sabbath*, which is Saturday the *last* day of the weeke, but the Lords day is Sunday the *first* day, and beginning of the weeke following; now how should a *bond* of one hundred pound to be paid on the seventh day of *May* be understood to bind to the day following the eighth day of *May* without a forfeiture of the Bond? Or a bond to be paid on Saturday the seventh day of the week, but to be forfeited if it be not paid till Sunday after the first day of the next weeke? When the fourth Commandement binds to the seventh and *last* day of the weeke, it cannot bind to the *first* day of the weeke, the Lords day; so you see that the Lords day was not commanded in the fourth Commandement in the *generall*, no more than in the particular.

Now as for the Saturday-seventh-day-Sabbath, this indeed was commanded in the fourth Commandement, but not *generally*, as is supposed,

ſod, comprizing under it Saturday and Sunday, both as ſpecialls: for Saturday the ſeventh day was no generall but a ſpeciall, ſingle, and individuall day, as is granted me. But I ſuppoſe Mr *Cawdry* underſtands his *one day in ſeven* to be the generall, and Saturday and Sunday the ſpecialls; but to expound the fourth Commandement of one day in ſeven is a falſe Expoſition, and as yet Mr *Cawdry* hath not proved it to be the ſenſe and meaning of the fourth Commandement; yet here and before he takes it for granted, and ſuppoſeth one day of ſeven to be the *genus* or generall of the fourth Commandement; but this his ſuppoſition is but *petitio principii*, a begging of the queſtion of me before he hath proved it.

Thus you have ſeene by my anſwer, that Mr *Cawdry* hath not by his ſecond inſtance vindicated himſelfe from this *Paradoxe* in expounding the fourth Commandement for one day of ſeven; nor hath he proved that the fourth Commandement may be expounded for one day of ſeven.

2. Whereas Mr *Cawdry* makes Sacrifices, and the Passeover, Baptisme, and the Lords Supper to be specialls, under the generall Obligation of the second Commandement, what doth he but *mingle* Ceremonials with Morals? And so *confound* the morall and the ceremoniall Laws; making Sacrifices, Circumcision, and Passeover to be commanded in the morall Law, as in the second Commandement? methinks Sir, it beseemes not a *Divine* of your ranke thus to *jumble* together Morals and Ceremonials. 2 Sacrifices and the Passover were *Gospell*, I say. Gospel *vailed* under shadows, typing out Christ; Baptisme and the Lords Supper are Gospell also, pointing to Christ; now Sir, will you mingle *Law* and *Gospell* together? Saying, Sacrifices, and the Passeover, Baptisme, and the Lords Supper fall under the *Obligation* of the second Commandement? Will you confound Law and Gospell? for the second Commandement is Law, and a part of the morall Law; now to thrust these Evangelicall things into the second Commandement, is to jumble together

together the Law and the Gospell; I confesse, you may as well thrust and crowd the *Lords day* into the fourth Commandement as you may crowd *Baptisme* and the *Lords Supper* into the second Commandement, but both are but *Carter-like* done.

3. Whereas Mr *Cawdry* in this instance, and in two or three passages of his before, makes the Saturday, and the Sunday or Lords day to be *species*, or specialls under the *genus* or generall of *one day in seven* in the fourth Commandement; how can he make this *Logicke* good? Suppose we that his *one day of seven* were the *genus*, since all *Logicians* know that the *genus* must have *two species* at least, these two daies cannot be the *species*: for during the old world, as he cals it, untill *Christ* the fourth Commandement, under one day of seven, had but *one species*, namely, the Saturday-seventh day-Sabbath as himself confesseth oftentimes; and since *Christ*, if the Lords day be a Sabbath, as he saies, and be also *packt*, or *patcht*, I may rather say, into the fourth Commandement, yet then from Christs time unto

to our times there hath been but one *ſpecies* under his *genus*, of one day in ſeven in the fourth Commandement, as the Sunday or Lords day; now, how can Mr *Cawdry* make his one day of ſeven to be a *genus*, when it ever wanted two *ſpecies*? As both before Chriſt, and ſince Chriſt; his *divinity*, in expounding the fourth Commandement for one day of ſeven, is like his *Logick* in making a *genus* to ſubſiſt with but one ſingle *ſpecies*.

His third inſtance.

Mr *Cawdry* in page 260. thus writeth; in *Levit.* 27. 30. *All the tithes or tenths of the land are the Lords, &c. The tenth of the Flocks which paſſeth under the rod ſhall be the Lords*; Where it is not neceſſary to take it for the tenth in *order*, but for any part of the ten. Alſo *Lev.* 23. 13. *Two tenth deales of flower, and a fourth part of an hin of oyle*; here any part of the ten, or any part of the foure is as much as this Law requires. So the ſeventh day mentioned in the fourth Commandement doth not neceſſarily ſignifie the ſeventh day in *order*, but may ſignifie a ſeventh day, or *one* day in

in the seven. So this is sufficient to take off the aspersion of *novelty* from our interpretation and exposition of the fourth Commandement, and to shew it to be consonant to the *Language* of the Scripture.

To this I say, whereas in expounding the fourth Commandement I do insist upon the *ordinall* word *seventh*, holding my selfe close to the *propriety* of it, which notifies properly (as hereafter shall appeare) not any one of the seven, but the last of the seven, and that single one which next follows the sixth. As when we say, the seventh yeare of the *Kings* Reigne, we meane not *one of the seven* indefinitely, that is, any one of the seven, but the last yeare of the seven, that which follows next after his sixth yeares Raigne. A *bond* to be paid the seventh day of *March* is not to be paid upon *one of the seven daies* of *March* indefinitely, that is, upon any one day of the seven, but definitely upon the seventh day from the first day of *March*; the like may be said of the eighth day for *Circumcision*, and of the fourteenth day for the *Passover*, and of other ordinall

numbers which in our English tongue end with *th*. Now Mr *Cawdry*, to overthrow this propriety of the *ordinall* number seventh, brings in this his instance of another *ordinall* number, the tythe, or tenth. Hereunto I answer.

1. Whereas Mr *Cawdry* would understand by the *Tythe* or tenth, not the tenth in order, but for any one of the ten indefinitely; hereby as he would overturne Gods definite and fixed time, so he doth an evill office to himselfe, and to the rest of the *Clergy* for matter of *Tythes*; for if the Shepheard hath in his Flock a blind or lame Lambe, a sick or leane Lambe, may he not give the Minister for tythe his blind Lambe, sick or leane Lambe? And if the Minister thinks himselfe wronged, may not the *Shepheard* plead *Scripture* to him? Saying, by the tythe or tenth God might enjoyne *one of ten*, that is, any one of the ten indefinitely. Mr *Cawdry* would be loath the Shepheard should so expound *Scripture* to him, and yet he will so expound the fourth Commandement to us, understanding by the seventh day

any

any one day of the seven.

Againe, God commanded *Circumcision* to be on the eighth; were Mr *Cawdry* to expound this Commandement he could say by the eighth day may be understood any *one of the eight daies*. The *Passover* on the fourteenth day, he could expound this ordinall fourteenth so, as they might eate it on any *one of the fourteene daies*.

2. Though there is not any Commandement in the New Testament for the *Lords day*, yet let us suppose one made by Christ, saying, *Remember the Lords day to sanctifie it; but the first day of the weeke is the Lords day*, &c. If I should answer to this Commandement as Mr *Cawdry* doth to Gods fourth Commandement, saying, the word *first* is an *ordinall* number indeed, but by the first day of the weeke, or first day of the seven, we may understand one day of the week, or one day of the seven indefinitely; for ordinall numbers, as the tenth of the Flock, and a tenth deale of flower, are so used in Scripture; how would Mr *Cawdry* and our new *Sabbatarians* exclaime of me for cor-

rupting the proper ſence of this new Commandement of *Chriſts?* and for beguiling them of their *new Sabbath day?* And yet thus they deale with *God*, and with his fourth Commandement, and no man may controule them without ſome heavy *cenſure* or other, for I run more hazard for maintaining the true expoſition of Gods Commandement than they do for corrupting it.

3. Be it ſo, that ſome few, as two or three ordinall numbers in Scripture be uſed improperly: ſo *Io.* 21.14. *This is the third time that Jeſus appeare*, &c. if this *third* time of Chriſts *apparition* may be upon ſome one of the three times only, and not on the laſt of the three, how ſhall we do for our new *Sabbath* on the *Lords day*? for Chriſts *apparitions* be brought to prove our new Sabbath. Againe, *Chriſt* roſe the *third* day, may this be expounded of, one of, or of any of the three daies? further I anſwer.

1. That this *particular* ordinall number *the ſeventh* mentioned in the fourth Commandement, is never uſed in Scripture but properly for the laſt of ſeven. As for other ordinall

nall numbers, ſome two or three, as the tenth of the Flock, and a fourth part of a hin of oyle, &c. theſe are uſed *improperly*, but there are an hundred Texts of ordinalls, all uſed properly for one or two uſed improperly.

2. Where an ordinall number is uſed improperly, it is ſo underſtood in a caſe of *neceſſity* only, when it cannot poſſibly be otherwiſe underſtood; as when the things numbred have in them neither *difference*, nor *order*, as a fourth part of an hin of oyle, and a tenth deale of flower; in ſuch a caſe we muſt underſtand them improperly as for any one of the number: ſo when *Chriſt* is called a *doore*, and the *bread* his *body*, we muſt take them improperly, but not alwaies in all texts ſo: for the proper ſenſe is ever holden for the true ſenſe, if nothing appeare to the contrary; now there is no *neceſſity* to depart from the proper ſenſe of the ordinall ſeventh in the fourth Commandement; for among the ſeven daies there is both *difference* and *order*, one orderly going after another; wherefore this ordinall ſeventh

must be *properly* understood for Saturday the last of seven; and so the *Church* of the Jews understood it, as appeares by their practice, keeping the Saturday Sabbath, now at *Amsterdam*, and elsewhere; but this I shall at our conclusion more abundantly prove, as that God intended in his fourth Commandement to have only the Saturday and last day of seven definitely for his Sabbath.

Thus you see his third and last instance answered; and as yet he hath not vindicated himselfe from his *Paradoxe*, nor proved that the fourth Commandement may be expounded for a seventh day, or for one day of seven indefinitely, that is, for any one day of the seven.

By the way note, that I have propounded his three *instances* in their *full strength*, as himselfe wrote them; the like faithfulneſſe I shall observe in repeating his ensuing *Arguments*; And though they be but triviall things, yet I have, and shall answer every one of them punctually, although he hath not been so candid towards me; for he hath not so much as *mentioned*, much lesse confuted my

best

beſt anſwers againſt the *Lords day*; if my things were as triviall as his, yet ſince he undertakes to confute me, it had been the part of a fair diſputant to mention and confute my anſwers, or elſe never to meddle with my *name* and *Books*, and ſo I returne.

Now he proceeds by ſundry *Arguments* that the ſeventh day, or laſt day of the ſeven, is not enjoyned in the fourth Commandement, but one day of the ſeven indefinitely; we ſhall anſwer them in order.

His firſt Argument.

Mr *Cawdry* in his ſecond part, page 261. thus reaſoneth: *If the order of the day (firſt or laſt) in the fourth Commandement be not ſubſtantially profitable, or being altered is no waies prejudiciall to Religion, then the ſeventh day was not commanded as the ſubject or ſubſtance of the fourth Commandement.*

But the order of the day, (firſt, or laſt, or any other) is not ſubſtantially profitable; or being altered is in any waies prejudiciall to Religion.

Therefore the ſeventh day in order

was not commanded as the subject or substance of the fourth Commandement.

I answer first to the first proposition, and to the consequent part of it, saying, Then the seventh day was not commanded as the *subject* or *substance* of the fourth Commandement; To this I say, the seventh day is *time* and *order*; now time and order are neither *subject* nor *substance*, but *adjunct*, *accident*, or *circumstance*; now if I should grant your *conclusion*, what were I the worse, or you the better by this Argument? For though the seventh day be not commanded as the subject or substance, yet if it be *commanded* as an adjunct to the duty of holinesse, or Gods worship, or as an accident or circumstance, it is *binding* to obedience: for it is a *commanded* adjunct, accident, or circumstance.

I answer now to the second proposition, and to the former part of it, saying, The order of the day, as the last day of seven, is not *substantially profitable*: To this I say, 1. What if it be not *substantially* profitable, if it be *circumstantially profitable*? Is

not

not this as much as can be expected of a commanded *time?* furthermore, if one day of seven, that is, any one of seven, be substantially profitable, as you Sir say, why should not the seventh and last day of the seven be also substantially profitable? Is not the seventh day one day of the seven?

I answer next to the latter part, saying, The seventh day being *altered*, it is not any waies *prejudiciall* to Religion. To this I say, 1. If this alteration be not prejudiciall to Religion, that is, to Gods worship in the day, yet it is prejudiciall to *God*, and to his fourth Commandement; for is it not prejudiciall to God to have his *holy day*, and the day chosen by him before all other daies of the seven, to be altered and changed, and so *rejected?*

Againe, suppose the alteration of the seventh day be no *dammage* to Religion and Gods worship in the day; so say I, the taking up of another day for it, as the Lords day, the first day of the weeke, this is no *gaine* or advantage to Religion and Gods worship; now will any wise

man make a change of any thing if it be not for a *better?* It is the part of a foole to change one Penny for another, or one Counter for another, both being alike. Furthermore, the alteration of the seventh day is as prejudiciall to Religion, as the setting up of the first day is advantagious to Religion; and therefore the seventh day may be as well the substance of the Commandement as the first day.

Againe, is it not prejudiciall to change the seventh day, which hath a divine institution and *precept* for it, and Gods *example* in resting on that day, for the Lords day, or first day, which hath no divine institution or *precept* for it, nor Christs *example* in resting on this day? For Christ made the *Lords day* a travelling day, and so did two of his Disciples, travelling sixty *furlongs* to *Emmaus*, and back againe to *Jerusalem*, which is fifteene miles, eight Furlongs to a mile, *Luk.* 24. 1, 23, 29, 33. *Joh.* 20. 19. this is more than a Sabbath daies journey.

To conclude, give me leave Sir, to retort your Argument against

your

your ſelfe on this manner.

If one day of ſeven indefinitely be not ſubſtantially profitable: or being altered is no way prejudiciall to Religion; then one day of ſeven was not commanded as the ſubject or ſubſtance of the fourth Commandement.

But one of ſeven indefinitely is not ſubſtantially profitable: or being altered to the ſeventh day definitely, it is no way prejudiciall to Religion.

Therefore one day of ſeven was not commanded as the ſubject or ſubſtance of the fourth Commandement. My anſwers to his Argument will cleare this Argument; ſo far of his firſt Argument.

His ſecond Argument.

If the ſeventh day was directly commanded as the ſubject or ſubſtance of the fourth Commandement, then it was commanded as Ceremoniall, or as Morall.

But the ſeventh day was neither commanded as Ceremoniall, nor as Morall.

Therefore the ſeventh day was not commanded at all in the fourth Commandement. *Anſwer*

Answer.

I have heard Country people say, Schollers can by Logick prove the Moone was made of a greene cheese; now is not Mr *Cawdry* such a Logician? for his conclusion saith, *The seventh day was not commanded at all in the fourth Commandement*, when with our *eyes* we see and read the contrary in the Commandement.

Further I answer, whereas he thinkes there is no *third* thing besides Morall and Ceremoniall, I give him this for a third thing, a *perpetuall positive*; and then though the seventh day was not commanded as Morall or Ceremoniall, yet it might be commanded as a perpetuall positive Ordinance.

Here againe Sir give me leave to retort your Argument upon your selfe on this manner.

If one day of seven indefinitely was directly commanded as the subject or substance of the fourth Commandement, then it was commanded as Ceremoniall or as Morall.

But one day of seven indefinitely

was

was neither commanded as Ceremoniall, nor as Morall; for there are no such words in the fourth Commandement as *one day in seven*; neither can they be gathered by consequence from it; and to suppose it is but to beg the question.

Therefore one day of seven was not commanded at all in the fourth Commandement.

If the seventh day, which *is expreſt* in the fourth Commandement, be not commanded as the subject of the fourth Commandement, how should one day of seven, which *is not expreſt* be the subject of it? And if there be no such thing in the fourth Commandement as *one day of seven indefinitely*, then it is neither Moral, nor Ceremoniall, but a *fantaſie* of mans braine.

His third Argument.

If the principall reaſons in the fourth Commandement be directly for one day in seven, and indirectly for that seventh and laſt day of the weeke; then the fourth Commandement muſt rather be underſtood of the number, for one day

in seven, then for the order, the last day of seven.

But the reasons are directly for one day in seven, and indirectly for that seventh and last day of seven, as being the day then appointed, Ergo *&c.*

Answer.

I see all along hitherto that Mr *Cawdry* sticks much at this *ordinall* number seventh in the fourth Commandement, and will not endure this word *order*; it seemes to me he had rather be out of order than in order, fearing that Gods order may make him turne *Jew* and keep the Saturday-Sabbath: for rather than he will admit of Gods order, the ordinall seventh, which implies the daies put into order, he will invent an Exposition of his own, which is without order, as one day of seven.

Furthermore, I have this one thing against his Argument, that he disputes *comparatively*, noted by the word *rather*, when he should dispute *absolutely*, and *positively*; for our question is not whether the fourth Commandement must *rather* be expounded

pounded of one day in ſeven than of the ſeventh day; but abſolutely and poſitively whether it *ought* to be expounded of the ſeventh day, or not of the ſeventh day; or whether it ought to be expounded of the ſeventh day, or of one day in ſeven, uncertainely which day; wherefore Sir, I deſire you to take home this Argument againe, and frame it anew, and ſee then if you can make any thing or nothing of it.

I have yet another thing againſt this Argument; whereas you do *compare* theſe two together, one day of ſeven and the ſeventh day, ſaying, the one muſt *rather* be taken than the other; here you compare *ens* with *non ens*; a thing which hath a *being* in the fourth Commandement, as the ſeventh day expreſſed, with that which hath *no being* in the fourth Commandement, as one day of ſeven indefinitely, which is neither expreſſed nor implied, but is a meere fiction of your own; remember Sir, that this is the place where you are to prove, if you can, that one day of ſeven indefinitly, that is, any one day of the ſeven is the ſenſe and mean-

ing of the fourth Commandement; but instead of proving it, you sleightly take it for granted you in a comparison *rather*, &c. and is not this *petere principium*, plainly to *beg the question?* for the comparative degree doth suppose the *positive* as granted; As for the *Bishop*, Dr *Hylin*, and Mr *Primrose*, you often *taxe* some of them for begging the question, and are you, Sir, so frequent in the use of this peece of *Sophistry?* This is not the first time I have taken you guilty, nor will it be the last time.

Againe, whereas you say, the *reasons* in the fourth Commandement are *directly* for one day in seven, and but *indirectly* for the seventh day.

1. Is it not strange that what is expressed should be indirectly in the Commandement, and what is not expressed should be directly in it?

2. As for the two reasons mentioned by him, the *former* is the *sixe daies labour*, whereby God perswades us to give him the seventh day, because he hath allowed us sixe daies for our selves; now forasmuch as our sixe daies labour must go *together* in labour, therefore this reason must

must be for the seventh and last day, not for one day of seven, or any one day of seven: for the sixe labouring daies going together, these are the *reasons*; now a reason cannot prove it selfe but another thing.

The *latter* reason, mentioned by him in page 268. and page 42. is *Gods example* in resting the seventh day, which example leades us to the seventh day also, not unto one day of the seven indefinitely: for *examples* lead us to follow them as *neerely*, as *closely*, and as *exactly* as we can, as *Copies* set to Schollars, and *Samplers* for Girles to sew by; and so *Moses* was to make the *Tabernacle* after the *patterne* which God shewed him in the Mount, *Exod.* 25. 40. now we then imitate God, and follow his example when we keep the seventh and last day of the weeke, for it is as neere to God as possibly we can come; so you see the reasons of the Commandement are plainly for the seventh day only.

But Mr *Cawdry* would have one day or any one day of the seven for his Sabbath, and is this to *imitate* God? Or rather to *crosse* God? For

when God rested on the seventh and *last* day of the weeke we will rest on the first day, at the *beginning* of the weeke, and yet not *ashamed* to say we *imitate* God, and follow his Example; yea, but saith Mr *Cawdry*, God rested one day of seven, and if we do so we imitate God. I Sir, but do you imitate God as *neerely*, as *closely*, and as *exactly* as you can, or as is possible? And as Scholars do, or ought their Copies? And as *Moses* did about the Tabernacle? Surely, it is no impossible thing for us to keep the Saturday for our Sabbath; but as Mr *Cawdry* loves not Gods *ordinall* number, the seventh, lest he should fall into Gods *order*, and so turne *Jew*: so he loves not to *imitate* God, lest he should turne *Sabbatarian*; if he should follow Gods example so exactly and closely as he may or can do, then he should be too too *like* God, and *resemble* God too much.

For conclusion, here againe, Sir, give me leave to retort this your Argument on this manner.

If the principall reasons in the fourth Commandement be directly for the seventh

venth day, and indirectly for one day in ſeven, then the fourth Commandement muſt rather be underſtood of the ſeventh day than of one day in ſeven.

But the reaſons are directly for the ſeventh day, and indirectly for one day in ſeven, as you have ſeen it proved before, *Ergo, &c.*

His fourth Argument.

If God intended the Jews ſhould rather ſanctifie the ſeventh part of their time than the ſeventh day, then the fourth Commandement doth more directly command one day in ſeven than that ſeventh day.

But God intended that the Jews ſhould rather ſanctifie the ſeventh part of their time than the ſeventh day, Ergo, &c.

Anſwer.

I pray Sir, what difference make you of theſe two, the ſeventh part of the Jews time and their ſeventh day? Will you compare a thing with it ſelfe? And make a ſhew of two things where there is but one

in divers words? Did not *Nehemiah*, and others of the Jews give God both the seventh part of their time, and also the seventh day? And doth not Mr *Cawdry* give Christ both the first part of his time, and also the first day? For ever since he was borne, or made conscience of the Lords day, which is the *first day* of the weeke, hath he not given Christ both his first part of time, and also his first day? a worthy comparison!

Againe, you dispute *comparatively*, whereas you should dispute *positively* and absolutely, as I said before; and here againe you have Mr *Cawdry's petitio principii*, begging his question where he should have proved it, if he could; is this the way to prove that *one day in seven* is the true expofition of the fourth Commandement? If it be, *Sophistry* is the way; now for these two faults mentioned I reject your Argument, and desire you to take it home againe, and amend them, and then send it abroad againe, to try if it may find any better successe.

As for your reason of the *sequell*, you

you say, it is because *so it may extend to us Gentiles also.* I pray Sir, why may not the seventh and last day of the weeke extend to us *Gentiles* as well as any one day of the seven?

But you thinke, Sir, that it was both *uncertaine* whether the Jews did *precisely* keep the seventh day or not, and that in some case it was *impossible* to be kept. I answer, 1. It matters not whether it be certaine or not that the Jews kept the seventh day: for we dispute not *de facto*, but *de jure*, of what they did do, but of what they ought to do. 2. Why may it not be as certaine that the Jews kept the seventh day, as that they kept your *one day of seven?*

As for the *impossibility* of their keeping it, because once the *Sun stood still* in *Joshuah's* time; To this I say, this standing still of the Sun made that day a *longer* day than any other day of that weeke, but not *another* day: as if it stood still on Friday the sixth day of the weeke, yet Saturday next was the seventh day, and so might possibly be kept.

I but, in regard of the Jews *di-*

persons, as when they were carried into *captivity* in remote Countries, they could not *possibly* keep one and the same day for the Sabbath: for the daies in places of a different Longitude begin at different times, and as some say, the beginning of the daies differ so much as the *Hollanders* lost a day in surrounding the World.

To these I answer; 1. If these things be so, how do the Jews keep the Sabbath day now at *Amsterdam*, and in other places of the world where they live? and how do we in *England* keep the *Lords day*? For our *daies* differ in their beginning from the daies at *Jerusalem* where Christ rose.

2. The ground of this errour lies in this, that they thinke when God commanded the Sabbath day at Mount *Sinai* he intended that whithersoever his people travelled their Sabbath must begin at the very same point of time that it began at mount *Sinai*; the which is impossible, and so God should command his people an *impossible* thing; for when they travelled from *Sinai* to the remotest

remoteſt parts in *Canaan* the daies had ſome difference in beginning.

Againe, the word *day* ſignifies the time of *light*, *Gen.* 1. 5. *God called the light day*, and ſo the ſeventh day is the ſeventh light; now when the ſeventh light began in every horizon, then the ſeventh day began, be it ſooner or latter; and this is all that God intended in his fourth Commandement.

To conclude, give me leave, Sir, to retort this your Argument alſo, in this manner.

If God intended the Jews ſhould rather ſanctifie the ſeventh day than the ſeventh part of their time; then the fourth Commandement doth more directly command the ſeventh day than one day in ſeven.

But God intended that the Jews ſhould rather ſanctifie the ſeventh day than the ſeventh part of their time, Ergo, &c. I ſhall as ſoone make this Argument good, as you ſhall make yours good, as appeares by my Anſwers to your Argument.

His fifth Argument.

If the fourth Commandement did directly, or as the ſubſtance of it, command

mand the seventh-day-Sabbath, then either we Christians must keep the same day still, or else the fourth Commandement is utterly void and abolished.

But we must neither keepe that day still, nor is the fourth Commandement, void and abolished. Ergo.

Answer.

As for his major I grant it; and himselfe *confirmes* it, saying, the Commandement is *morall* as well as the other Laws in the *Decalogue*, for our *Saviour* confirmes it, *Mat.* 5. 18. saying, not one *jot* or *tittle* of the *Law* shall passe away, *&c.* Now the the seventh-day-Sabbath is more than a *jot* or *tittle* of the fourth Commandement, wherefore we must turne *Sabbatarians*, or else the fourth Commandement is void and abolished; thus saith Mr *Cawdry*.

As for his minor, I utterly deny the former part of it, saying *we must not keepe that day still*; meaning it of the seventh day. But why so? I pray Sir, what hinders but that we may keepe the old Sabbath day still? If it *pleased you* to keep it as it *pleased*

God

God to command it, *Exo.* 20. 8. and as it *pleased Christ* to ratifie it, *Mat.* 5. 18. I know nothing against our keeping it but your, and other mens *slanderous* words of it, as that it is *Judaisme*, and we must turne Jews to loath Gods people of his Sabbath. But do you thinke God commanded any thing in his ten Commandements, the doing whereof, would make *Christians* turne *Jews*? is any thing in the fourth Commandement *Ceremoniall*, shadowing out Christ as yet to come in the flesh? If in this sense we should keep the Sabbath, it were properly called Judaisme: but where is the *Christian* that keeps it in this sense, or desires to keepe it in this sense?

But since he hath not *proved* this former part of his Assumption, I may safely *deny* it: and so this his fifth Argument stands for a *Cypher*; so still you see how far Mr *Cawdry* falls short of proving by these Arguments that the seventh day is not commanded as the substance of the fourth Commandement, and that *one day of seven* is the substance of it.

His sixth and last Argument.

If the seventh-day-Sabbath was directly commanded in the fourth Commandement, then there can no sufficient reason be given why the fourth Commandement should be put into the Decalogue, and not amongst other Ceremoniall Commandements peculiar to the Jews.

Answer.

1. I answer to his proposition thus: why may there not be as good reason given, and as sufficient, for the seventh-day-Sabbath to be put into the Decalogue, as for *one day in seven indefinitely*, which never was in the fourth Commandement, or in the Decalogue, neither expressely, nor by consequence.

2. Whereas you say, the fourth Commandement must not be put into the Decalogue among the Morals, but amongst the *Ceremonials*; it must be so, because you take it for granted that the seventh-day-Sabbath was a *Ceremony*; and is not this to

beg

beg a queſtion? For you do not ſo much as attempt to prove it a Ceremony; and I beleeve all the skill you have cannot prove it a Ceremony; ſo by this Argument you do but beg a queſtion, which you ſhould have proved, but have not, nor can prove it; but *begging the queſtion* when, and where you ſhould prove it, is no rare thing with you; this is your *Logick*, whereby you would prove that the fourth Commandement is to be *expounded* for *one day of ſeven.*

I have now made punctuall anſwers unto all Mr *Cawdry's* ſixe Arguments, whereby he hath endeavoured, but all in vaine, to prove that the ſeventh-day Sabbath is not *directly* and *expreſſely* commanded in the fourth Commandement, a thing ſo ſtrangely *abſurd*, that I never read any *Author* beſides himſelfe to deny it; and beſides, he hath endeavoured, though alſo in vaine, to prove, that *one day in ſeven* indefinitely, that is, any one day of the ſeven is directly commanded in the fourth Commandement; and that this is the true expoſition, ſenſe, and meaning of the fourth Commande-

ment; but never did *Jesuite* more shamefully corrupt the second Commandement about *Images*, or any other Scripture, than Mr *Cawdry* hath corrupted Gods fourth Commandement, as appeares by my severall answers to his fixe Arguments; He hath done good service to Almighty God to use his *wits* to overthrow his *Sabbaths*, and corrupt one of his *Ten* Commandements: wherefore he may expect his *reward* when God shall come to give every one according as his own *works* have beene.

Having *vindicated* the fourth Commandement from Mr *Cawdry's* corrupt glosses, and false Exposition of it: now in the last place I shall *prove* against Mr *Cawdry* that one day of seven is not the sense and meaning of the fourth Commandement, but the seventh and last day of the week, which fals upon our Saturday; in my proofe whereof Mr *Cawdry* shall see that we have many more Arguments out of the fourth Commandement to prove this point than the *ordinall* number *seventh*.

By the great paines Mr *Cawdry* hath taken to draw the fourth Commandement

mandement to the expoſition of *one day in ſeven*; and alſo, for that by this *Expoſition* he hath made *anſwer* to many of my twenty foure Arguments; hereby you may perceive that the maine and chiefe controverſie about the *Sabbath* will be determined by *his* or *my* Expoſition of the fourth Commandement; wherefore I ſhall be the larger in proving my *Expoſition* for the ſeventh and laſt day of the weeke: and ſo I come to prove this point;

That the fourth Commandement ought not to be expounded for one day of ſeven, but of the ſeventh and laſt day of ſeven definitely.

Argument the firſt.

My firſt Argument ſhall be taken out of the *firſt* words of the fourth Commandement, *Remember the Sabbath day.* This word *Sabbath*, I confeſſe, ſignifies *Reſt*; but there is more in it than ſo: for it is alſo a *proper name* for one of the daies of the weeke, as for the ſeventh and laſt day, which is our Saturday, like

as *Lords day* is a proper name for the first day of the weeke, which is our Sunday; and thus I prove it.

1. Whereſoever in the Old or New Teſtaments you read the word *Sabbath*, it being ſpoken of a *weekly day*, it is never uſed but for a proper name for one of the weeke daies, as for Saturday the Seventh and laſt day of the weeke; no inſtance can be given to the contrary. 2. The *Jews* did antiently reckon their daies of the weeke thus, Saturday they called *Sabbathum*, Sabbath day; Sunday they called τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, *Joh.* 20. 1. the firſt day of the Sabbath; Munday the ſecond of the Sabbath &c. yea, the Jews now at *Amſterdam* call Saturday the Sabbath day; ſo ſtill it is uſed for a proper name for our Saturday. 3. The *Latines* call our Saturday *Sabbatum* the Sabbath day, as is to be ſeene in all Latine *Dictionaries*; yea, it is ſo in *England*; for when a *writ* comes downe from the Superiour Courts for a mans appearance, if it be for his appearance on Saturday, it is written *Sabbatum*, and *die Sabbati*. 4. I appeale to all Scholars,

lars, if the word *Sabbatum* be not used in the antient *Histories* of the Church for Saturday the seventh and last day of the weeke. Thus you see that *Sabbath day* is a proper name for our Saturday the seventh day; now proper names of things are *definite*, not *indefinite*; they do limit the thing named to one certaine individuall thing, and leave it not at *rovers* and uncertainties, as unto any one thing, or as unto *any one day of the seven*, as Mr *Cawdry's* idle fancy is. I cannot spare a man so grossely absurd in expounding Gods fourth Commandement.

But against this it is objected, that Sabbath day is no proper name, but a *common* name; for the *yearely* festivals were also called *Sabbaths*, *Levit.* 23.24. To this I answer, 1. We speake of *weekely* dayes, and in relation to the fourth Commandement, not of yearely daies, in reference to ceremoniall Laws. 2. It will no more hinder the Sabbath day to be a proper name for one of the week daies, than it will hinder the names of *Peter* and *John* for proper names of two Apostles, because other men

then living, and no Apostles, have the same names; so far of my first Argument.

Argument the second.

My second Argument shall be taken out of the *middle* part of the fourth Commandement, saying, *But the seventh day is the Sabbath*, &c. for the right understanding and exposition of this word *seventh*, we must know there are two sorts of numbers, a *Cardinall*, and an *Ordinal*; the Cardinall numbers are these, one, two, three, foure, five, sixe, seven, &c. now these comprize *all* the the things numbred without difference; the *Ordinall* numbers are these, first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, &c. now these notifie not *all*, but *one* of the things numbred, and considers that one in a due *order* for the last of the things numbred as for the seventh which follows the sixth going in order before it, not any one of them without difference; as when we say, the seventh day of the *month*, we meane not as *Mr Cawdry* would, any one of the

the seven daies, but the last of the seven daies which follow the sixe daies in order before it. And by the seventh yeare of the *Kings Reigne* is not understood one of the seven yeares indefinitely, but the last yeare of the seven definitely and precisely. So this word *seventh* in the fourth Commandement is not a cardinall, but an ordinall number, notifying not any one of the seven daies, but the seventh and last day of the seven, which is our Saturday.

Our *Sunday* or *Lords day* is often in Scripture called the *first day of the weeke*, *Mat.* 28.1. *Mar.* 16.2,9. *Luk.* 24.1. *Joh.* 20.1,19. *Acts* 20.7. 1 *Cor.* 16.2. now then reckon onwards, and *Saturday* will be the seventh and *last* day of the weeke; As there is but one Lords day, or one *first* day of the weeke, so reckoning onward there can be but one Saturday, or one *seventh* day of the weeke, which must needs be a definite and certain day; now Saturday is no uncertaine day at *revers*, or any one of the seven daies, uncertaine which day it is: so the fourth Commandement is

to be expounded of Saturday, and the ſeventh day, or laſt day of the ſeven definitely, not of any day of the ſeven.

I know they uſe to object a tenth deale of flower, and a fourth part of an hin of oyle, but this will not make the ſeventh yeare of the *Kings Reigne* to be any one of the ſeven yeares: nor will it make the *Lords day*, which is the *firſt day* of the weeke, to be any one day of the weeke, uncertaine which day it is; but to this I have anſwered fully before, in my anſwer to his third inſtance, and ſhall not here repeat it; ſo far of my ſecond Argument, wherein the point is proved both by the ordinall ſeventh in the fourth Commandement, and alſo by the ordinall *firſt* aſcribed to the *Lords day*.

Argument the third.

My third Argument ſhall be taken out of the *laſt* part of the fourth Commandement, ſaying, *For God reſted the ſeventh day, and ſanctified the Sabbath day*: ſo there we have the ſeventh

ſeventh day mentioned *before* in the Commandement, *Exod* 20.10, repeated, and the Sabbath day, mentioned *before* in the Commandement, *Exod*, 20.8. repeated alſo; whence I gather, that the words *Sabbath day* at the *beginning* of the Commandement, and the ſame words at the *ending* of the Commandement ſpeake both of one and the ſame revolution of time and day; and the words *ſeventh day* in the former part of the Commandement, and the ſame words repeated in the latter part of the Commandement are to be underſtood of the ſame time and day.

For 1. In a *continued* ſpeech, *one* word or phraſe often repeated is to be underſtood in *one* and the ſame ſenſe, ſo as if in the latter part of the ſpeech the words be *definite*, then ſo they muſt be in the former part alſo. 2. Gods *reſt* on the ſeventh day, and *ſanctifying* the Sabbath day, are brought as an Argument, reaſon, or motive to perſwade men to keepe this ſeventh-day Sabbath; now the ſame words in the *queſtion* or concluſion, repeated in the *Argument* or motive, muſt

have

have one and the ſame ſenſe if there be faire dealing: ſo as if the one be to be underſtood *definitely*, and of a time certaine, then ſo muſt the other be underſtood alſo. 3. Theſe words, the ſeventh daies reſt of God, and Gods ſanctifying the Sabbath day, are propounded as Gods *example* for us to *imitate* and follow; now the *Scholar* muſt follow his Copy as neare as poſſibly he can; *Moſes* was to follow Gods *paterne* of the Tabernacle, even to an haires breadth if poſſible: ſo are we to imitate Gods example by keeping the *ſame* ſeventh-day Sabbath weekly which God kept at the Creation.

By theſe three reaſons it appeares, that being the ſame words muſt have the ſame ſenſe in all the fourth Commandement, and that the day wherein God reſted at the Creation, and which then he ſanctified, being it was the ſeventh and laſt day of the weeke, following his fixe daies creating, it was not any *one day of the ſeven*, but the laſt day of the ſeven definitely; therefore the fourth Commandement is to be expounded throughout, from the beginning

ginning to the ending of it; for the ſeventh and laſt day of the weeke, which is a fixed, limited, and definite day, not a day at randome, rovers, and uncertaine, as any *one day of the ſeven*. The day, I ſay, whereon God reſted at the Creation, being certainly the ſeventh, and laſt day of the ſeven, or weeke; the whole fourth Commandement muſt be expounded of the ſame ſeventh, and laſt day of the ſeven, or weeke certainly, not at rovers, as appeares by my three reaſons given; ſo far of my third Argument.

Argument the fourth.

My fourth Argument ſhall be taken out of the *body* of the fourth Commandement, ſaying, *Sixe daies ſhalt thou labour, but the ſeventh day thou ſhalt reſt*, Exod. 20. 9, 10. *For in ſixe daies the Lord made the heaven and the earth, &c. and he reſted the ſeventh day*, Exod. 20. 11. whence I note, that the ſixe daies, wherein God created the world, were his working daies, and they all went *together*, no reſting or Sabbath day comming be-

tweene them: and the fixe working daies of man went also *all together*, no resting or Sabbath day comming betweene them; whence it follows, that of necessity the Sabbath day, in the fourth Commandement, could not possibly be *appointed* for *one day of seven indefinitely*, that is, for any one day of the seven indifferently; for the fixe daies labour ought to go together for working daies; and therefore the Sabbath day could not come in betweene any of the fixe working daies, or be any one of them; wherefore of necessity the Sabbath day must fall after the fixe working daies, upon the seventh and last day of the weeke, and not upon any *one of the seven daies*; so far of my fourth Argument.

Argument the fifth.

If there never was from the giving of the Law upon Mount Sinai *downe to our times any day known in the Churches, but one weekly day for the seventh day; nor any day known for the Sabbath day weekly but one, namely,*

Saturday

Saturday the ſeventh and laſt day of the weeke; then the fourth Commandement ought to be expounded of that one ſeventh day definitely, and of that one Sabbath day, namely, Saturday the ſeventh and laſt day of the weeke: and not for any one of the ſeven daies, or for a Sabbath day at rovers and uncertainly.

But there never was from the giving of the Law upon Mount Sinai *down to our times any day known in the Churches, but one weekely day for the ſeventh day; nor any day known for the Sabbath day weekly but one, namely, Saturday the ſeventh and laſt day of the weeke.*

Therefore the fourth Commandement ought to be expounded of that one ſeventh day definitely, and of that one Sabbath day, namely, Saturday the ſeventh and laſt day of the weeke: and not for any one of the ſeven daies, or for a Sabbath day at rovers and uncertainly.

As for the firſt propoſition, it is ſo cleare as it needs no proofe; only remember this, that we ſpeake of a Sabbath *weekly*, not of any anniver-

sary and *yearely* Sabbath; which belonged not to the fourth Commandement, but to their severall and ceremoniall Commandements: but we have to do only with the fourth Commandement, and the weekely Sabbaths in relation to it. And so I come to prove my second Proposition in both the parts.

1. At the Creation God began to number the daies of the weeke by these *ordinall* numbers, the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and the *last* was the seventh day, *Gen.*1. 5,8,&c. *Gen.*2.2,3. this numbring of the weeke daies continued in the Church unto the giving of the *Law* upon Mount *Sinai*, *Exod.* 20.9,10. from thence it continued in the Church untill *christs time*, *Mat.*28.1. *Mar.*16 2,9. and in all these times no day was known to be the seventh but one, namely, Saturday; and from Christs time unto *ours* it is still so known: for all Divines, Antient, and Moderne, call our Sunday, or *Lords day*, the *first* day of the weeke, and so consequently Saturday if you reekon onwards the seventh day; so

there

there being no ſeventh day but one, namely Saturday, the fourth Commandement muſt be expounded of Saturday the ſeventh day, and not of one day in ſeven uncertainly.

2. As for the name *Sabbath day*, it began in the Church for a weekly day before the giving of the *Law*, *Exod.* 16. 22, 23. from thence unto the giving of the Law it continued for a weekly day, *Exod.* 20. 8, 9, 10. from the giving of the Law unto *Chriſt* it ſtill continued in the Church, *Iſa.* 56. 2, 6. *Iſa.* 58. 13. *Neh.* 13. 15. *Mat.* 28. 1. *Luk.* 23. 56. with *Luk.* 24. 1. and from Chriſt's time it hath continued unto our time; for Eccleſiaſticall *Hiſtorians* antiently uſed the name Sabbath day for Saturday; the *Latines* do ſo to this day, and in *England*, as in the caſe of a *Writ*, we do the ſame, as I have ſhewn before; wherefore ſince there never was, nor is known in the Churches, any weekly day named *Sabbath day* but one, namely Saturday; therefore the fourth Commandement muſt be expounded of this one day Saturday, the ſeventh and laſt day of

the weeke, and not of a Sabbath day indefinitely, as uncertaine which day it is; thus you have seene this Argument proved.

But it will be said, Is not our *Lords day* commonly called *Sabbath day* in all *Pulpits*, and in all *Books*? I answer, yea: it is so called by such as love to *miscall* things, and to *nick-name* daies; so they may call it they please every *Fast day*, every *Thanksgiving day*, & every *Christmas day* But sure I am, this is but a *novelty* of *yesterdaies* standing; and as the *name* is novell, so is the *observation* of the Lords day, as, or for a Sabbath novell also, as by and by you shall see: For,

1. The Lords day was never called Sabbath day in any *Scripture* of the New Testament; let them shew us a Text for it if they can.

2. These Authors before mentioned, St *Augustine*, *Peter Martyr*, *Calvin*, *Zanchie*, *Ursinus*, *Paræus*, *Chemnitius*, *Melanchton*, with many others, all these wrote of the *Lords day*; that it is but an *indifferent* thing, and of the same authority with *Good Friday* the

the Passion day, *Christmas day*, and o her *holy daies* of the Church; and therefore these men could not think in their times the Lords day was a Sabbath: or call the Lords day Sabbath day, as we do in reference to the fourth Commandement.

3. In the fifth yeare of *Edward* the sixth an Act was made for the keeping of *Holy daies*, as *Sunday*, St *Matthews* day, St *Marks* day, and the other holy daies: In which *Act*, both the *King*, the Lords spirituall the *Bishops*, the *Lords* Temporall, and the House of *Commons* expressely confessed that they knew no *Scripture* for *Sunday*, or the other *Holy daies*, and therefore they could not call Sunday, or St *Matthews* day Sabbath daies, and therefore this nicknaming of daies, as to call the Sunday and Lords day Sabbath day, and to keepe it as a Sabbath, is but a *novelty*, and sprang up but since *Edward* the sixth his daies.

4. I am sixty foure yeares of Age, and so cannot remember much above fifty yeares, yet I do remember such works commonly done on the *Lords*

day, as I am ſure are no Sabbath days works: For in the City of *Norwich*, about fifty yeares ago, the City *Waits*, or Muſitians were wont for divers weekes in the yeare to play upon the Market *Croſſe* on the latter part of the Lords day, thouſands of people there aſſembled to heare them. At the new elected *Majors* gate they played at *Waſters* or Cudgels on the latter part of the Lords day, with hundreds of people looking on. And the Sealing *Office* was open, and Weavers carrying and re-carrying their Stuffs to be ſealed. The Merchants bought their Stuffs on the Lords day, and packed them in great packs the ſame day: and the *Carts* loaded the Stuffs the ſame day at night, and went towards *London* by foure a clock the next morning; theſe things were done with the knowledge of all the *Magiſtrates*, and without contradiction of the moſt godly *Miniſters*. I have been credibly informed, that about ten yeares before my time a *religious Grocer* in the City did open his ſhop ordinarily on the *Lords day*, and Mr

Moore,

Moore, the moſt religious *Miniſter* then in the City, hath come into the Shop, ſeeing them buying and ſelling Grocery wares, and did never rebuke them for it, or ſay, why do you ſo? And another antient and religious man a *Shoomaker* told me this day, that in his younger time *Shoomakers* ſold ſhooes on the Lords day ordinarily; wherefore the *obſervation* of the *Lords day* as a Sabbath day is but a *novelty*, and they that *thus kept it* could not *thinke* it was a Sabbath day, or *call* it a Sabbath day; ſo far of my fifth Argument.

Argument the ſixth.

If the fourth Commandement was expounded by Moſes *and the Prophets for Saturday the ſeventh and laſt day of the weeke, and not for Sunday the firſt day of the weeke, or any one day of the ſeven; then the fourth Commandement is now to be expounded for Saturday the ſeventh and laſt day of the weeke, and not for Sunday the firſt day of the weeke, or for any one day of the ſeven.*

But the fourth Commandement was expounded by Moſes *and the Prophets for Saturday the ſeventh and laſt day of the weeke, and not for Sunday the firſt day of the weeke; or for one day of ſeven:*

Therefore the fourth Commandement ought in our times to be expounded for Saturday the ſeventh and laſt day of the weeke, not for Sunday the firſt day of the weeke, or for any one day of the ſeven.

As for the firſt *propoſition*, it ſtands firme by this reaſon; Looke what was once the true ſenſe and meaning of Gods *Laws*, the ſame is the ſenſe and meaning of it for ever after: for the *ſenſe* and meaning of Scripture do not vary and change with the change of times; as if Scripture had one expoſition and meaning to day, and another to morrow; we can find no better rule for the expounding of any Text of Scripture in the Old Teſtament, than to expound it as *Moſes* and the *Prophets* did antiently; If therefore the fourth Commandement was antiently *expounded* for Saturday, it muſt be ſo expounded

expounded ſtill, and in our times. Take a ceremoniall Law, as that of *Circumciſion*, or the *Paſſeover*, and if you will expound and open the ſenſe of it now, you muſt render the ſame ſenſe of it now which *Moſes* and the Prophets gave of it antiently, or elſe your expoſition is falſe; I do not ſay a ceremoniall Law *binds* now as it did antiently, but yet I ſay the *expoſition* of it is the ſame now which it was antiently: as if you fall upon expoſition of the *time* and *day* of Circumciſion, or the Paſſover, you muſt expound it now of the eighth *day*, not of the ſeventh or ninth day; and of the foureteenth day of the *month*, not of the foureteenth day of the *yeare*; and ſo you muſt deale with every of the ten morall Commandements, or elſe you deale falſely with them.

As for the ſecond *Propoſition*, it is cleare that *Moſes* and the *Prophets* did expound the fourth Commandement to their people the Jews for Saturday the ſeventh and laſt day of the weeke, not for Sunday the firſt day of the weeke, or for any *one*

day

day of the seven, because the Church of the *Jews*, who were taught and instructed by *Moses* and the *Prophets*, kept the Saturday, and not the Sunday by the fourth Commandement; yea, this Mr *Cawdry* confesseth, saying, *The seventh and last day of the weeke was appointed to the old world.* that is, to the Jews; so far of my sixth Argument.

Argument the seventh.

If the Lords day be rightly expounded for the first day of the weeke, and not for any one day of the weeke, uncertaine which day it is, then the Sabbath day must be expounded for the seventh and last day of the weeke, and not for any one day of the seven, uncertaine which day it is. The reason hereof is one and the same; for when you read of a day called the *Lords day*, *Rev.* 1. 10. you understand it of the *first day of the weeke*, and of no other day, because you read elsewhere that Christ our Lord *rose* on the *first* day of the weeke, *Mar.* 16. 9. so when we read of the *Sabbath day*,

day, *Exod.* 20.8. and read againe in the ſame fourth Commandement, *The ſeventh day is the Sabbath*, *Exod.* 20.10. we muſt underſtand it of the ſeventh and *laſt* day of the week, and of no other day; for if the *ordinall* number *firſt* be underſtood properly for the firſt day of the ſeven, and not improperly for any one of the ſeven as touching the Lords day; ſo the *ordinall* number *ſeventh* muſt be underſtood properly alſo for the laſt of ſeven, not improperly for any *one of the ſeven* as touching the antient Sabbath day; if the one be taken properly, ſo muſt the other; and if the one be take improperly, ſo may the other; ſo far of my ſeventh Argument.

Thus I have proved by ſeven Arguments that the fourth Commandement muſt be expounded of *Saturday* the ſeventh and laſt day of the weeke, and not of any *one of the ſeven daies*. Now for a further *vindication* of the fourth Commandement, I ſhall ſhew how *abſurd* it is for Mr *Cawdry* to deny the Saturday, the ſeventh and laſt day, to be ex-

preſſely commanded in the fourth Commandement, and to expound it of a Sabbath day indefinitely, and of one day of ſeven indefinitely.

Of the abſurdneſſe to reject the expoſition of the fourth Commandement for the Sabbath day definitely, and the ſeventh and laſt day of the ſeven definitely, and to expound it of a Sabbath day indefinitely, and of a ſeventh day indefinitely, or of one day in ſeven.

The firſt abſurdity.

If by the word *Sabbath* in the fourth Commandement we may underſtand a Sabbath day uncertainly, as a *reſt* upon any of the ſeven daies; and by the word *ſeventh* any one of the ſeven daies; then we may keep two Sabbath daies together without ſix daies labour going betweene them: As for example, we may keep the *Saturday* the laſt of the weeke, and *Sunday* the firſt of the next weeke; and ſo two Sabbaths go together, no working daies coming

ing betweene them, and is not this absurd? For Saturday is one day of the seven in the former weeke, and Sunday after is one day of the seven in the latter weeke.

Againe, If the former please not, then take this; *Christ* did lye in his grave upon Saturday, which by the *Jews* was kept for the Sabbath day according to the fourth Commandement, *Luk.*23 56. Now if *Christians* kept the Sunday or Lords day, being the next day following the Sabbath day, were not then two Sabbath daies kept together without any working daies comming between them? And is not this absurd? Furthermore, and if *both daies* were kept by the fourth Commandement, is not this much more absurd? So far of the first absurdity.

The second absurdity.

If by *Sabbath* we may understand a *rest* on any day of the weeke; and by *seventh* any one of the seven daies; then we may keepe by the fourth Commandement *Sunday* the

Lords day this weeke in memory of Christs *Resurrection*, and *Good Friday* in the next weeke, or every other Friday in the yeare in memory of Christs *Passion*: for as Sunday is one day of the seven in this weeke, so Friday is one day of the seven in the next weeke; and is not this absurd? And to keepe these two daies by the fourth Commandement also, is not this much more absurd; so far of the second absurdity.

But perhaps you will say, we have *Scripture* for the *Lords day*, but you have none for *Good Friday*. I answer, If I would abuse Scripture for Friday, as you abuse Scripture for the Lords day, I could alledge a Text, having as much colour in it as the best of your Texts; see for this purpose, *Zech.* 12.10, &c. *They shall looke upon me whom they have pierced, and mourne for him, as one mourneth for his only Son.* This Text may be applyed to Good-Friday, wherein Christ was *pierced* for our *Sins*, and wrought the worke of our eternall *Redemption*, and said upon his

his Crosse, now *It is finished*, *Ioh.* 19. 30. So we may keep the Lords day every other weeke in memory of Christs Resurrection, and every other Friday as our Christian Sabbath in memory of Christs Passion and our Redemption.

But you will say, the Sabbath day is a day of *rejoycing*, but Good Friday is a day of *mourning*. To this I answer, the Sabbath day in the fourth Commandement was kept in memory of the *Creation*, and yet you can keepe the Lords day by the fourth Commandement in memory of the *Resurrection*; why then may we not keepe sometimes the memory of Christs Passion and our Redemption on *Friday* by the fourth Commandement as well as Sunday, or the Lords day, in memory of the *Resurrection* by the fourth Commandement? but a change in both; I know indeed that this Text, *Zech.* 12.10. is liable to many *just* exceptions, and so is the *best Text* alledged by Mr *Cawdry* for the Lords day; but would he be pleased to take Good Friday into his *favour* as he

hath done the Lords day, he could with a little of his *Logick*, mingled with much of his *Rhetorick*, and some of his *Sophistry*, make this Text, *Zech.* 12.10. as plausible a Text before the multitude for *Good Friday*, as is his best Text for the *Lords day*. And so I come to the third absurdity.

The third absurdity.

If by Sabbath we may understand any day of the weeke wherein we *rest*; and by seventh any one day of the seven; then first, The *Jews* were no more bound to keepe *Saturday* the last day of seven than to keepe the Lords day, or *Sunday* the first day of the seven; for the Sunday was then some one day of the seven.

Secondly, Then we *christians* may keep the *Saturday* Sabbath; for this day is one day of the seven; but we may not keepe the Saturday, as they say, because it is *Judaisme*, as they call it; and it is expired, and abolished, as they say.

Now

Now are not these two things two absurdities? So far of this third absurdity.

The fourth absurdity.

To expound the fourth Commandement for *one day of seven* is absurd, because we have but one day of sixe if they *reject* the seventh and last day of the *weeke*; take away *Saturday*, the seventh day, as an abolished, or expired day, which may not be kept for feare of *Judaisme*, and then you have remaining but sixe daies in every weeke; and therefore if you take any day of these sixe daies for a Sabbath, you take but one day out of sixe daies, not one day out of seven daies; for one of the seven daies is exempted and excepted, so as it may not be taken. In case we were wont to choose a *Major* out of seven Citizens, and now the *King* forbids us to choose the last man of the seven because he is sickly, and like to dye, or dead; though antiently our choice was one out of seven, yet

now it is but one out of sixe.

God commands to keep the seventh day holy, but Mr *Cawdry* hath brought it down to *one day* of seven, and upon further search it is come down to *one day* of sixe; So far of this fourth Absurdity.

The fifth Absurdity.

It is *absurd*, if not also *impious* and wicked, to alter the exposition, sense, and meaning of the *Ceremoniall* Commandements; and therefore it must be so to alter the exposition of the fourth Commandement, or any of the ten *morall* Commandements; take these instances: first, see *Lev.* 23.24. *In the seventh month, and the first day of the month ye shall have a Sabbath for the remembrance of blowing the Trumpet*, &c. were it not an impious thing to alter the sense of this Commandement, saying, God intended no more by this ordinall number the seventh *month* but this, that the people should give him a *Sabbath* in any *one of the seven months*? Secondly,

see

ſee *Lev.*25.4. *Sixe yeares thou ſhalt ſow thy field, but the ſeventh yeare ſhall be a Sabbath*, &c. Had Mr *Cawdry* wrote in *Moſes* daies he could have taught the people that they might give God but ſome *one* or *other* of the ſeven *yeares* for a Sabbath. Thirdly, the *Paſſeover* was to be kept on the fourteenth day of the *month*; I, could Mr *Cawdry* ſay, that is upon ſome *one* or *other* of the fourteene daies. Fourthly, the eighth day was appointed for *Circumciſion*; yet, can Mr *Cawdry* ſay, by this *ordinall* number the eighth may be meant *one of the eight daies*, as the firſt, or third, *&c.* Fifthly, *Chriſt* roſe the *third* day, but it may be upon ſome *one* of the three daies, as on the firſt day or ſecond. God commanded Circumciſion on the eighth day; may not Mr *Cawdry* ſay, hence Chriſtians be bound to *baptize* Children on the ninth day, the day after, or on the firſt day? For he ſaith, we are to keep our *Sabbath* on the eighth or firſt day. Is not this to make the Scriptures a *Noſe* of *Waxe?* If it be abſurd, yea, and

wickedly done to alter the ſenſe of of the Ceremoniall Laws, is it not ſo too to alter the ſenſe of a morall Law?

The ſixth Abſurdity.

Suppoſing, but not granting, that Mr *Brabourne* were bound in a *bond* to pay to Mr *Cawdry* twenty pounds upon *Chriſtmas* day the twenty fifth day of *December*, when Mr *Cawdry* can make him beleeve that this twenty pounds is due to him upon the *firſt* day of *December*, or upon any *one* of the twenty five daies of *December*; *then* ſhall he make him beleeve alſo, that *when* God binds men in the bond of the fourth Commandement to ſanctifie the *Sabbath* day, the ſeventh day of the weeke, *then* he binds men by his bond of the fourth Commandement to ſanctifie the *firſt* day of the week the *Lords day*, or any one of the ſeven daies. Our common *Lawyers* in pleading a *Bond* before a Judge, would be aſhamed of ſuch *Law*; but our eminent *Divines* in preaching to the people

people of the *bond* of the fourth Commandement are not aſhamed of ſuch *Divinity*. Againe, *when* Mr *Cawdry* will be willing to take for his *tenth*, or tithe *Lambe* any one of the ten, be it a rotten, lame, leane, or blind Lambe, *then* it may be he ſhall perſwade me, that by Gods ſeventh day we may underſtand ſome *one day* of the ſixe *working daies*.

The ſeventh Abſurdity.

All *Divines* that I have read, confeſſe, that the ſeventh day, and Saturday-Sabbath, was commanded to the *Jews* in the fourth Commandement; and the *Jews* now living whereſoever, do keepe the Saturday by the fourth Commandement; yea, and Mr *Cawdry* ſaith often in his Books of the Sabbath, that the ſeventh and laſt day was appointed to the old world, that is, to the Jews; but if now, and ſince *Chriſt*, the Saturday and ſeventh-day-Sabbath be not commanded in the fourth Commandement, but ſome other

one

one day of seven, as the *Lords day*, the first day of the weeke, then the *sense* and *meaning* of the fourth Commandement is *altered* and *changed* from what it was *antiently*, and a *new* sense and meaning is given of it; if this be not an absurdity, or rather a *madnesse*, I know not what is.

Shall the *words* in the Scripture be thought to change their sense with the times? Shall they have one sense to day, and another to morrow? Is not this the sin of him that thought he might *change times and Laws*, *Dan.7.25.*

That *one* word in *divers* Texts may signifie divers things is nothing strange; but that one and the same word in one and the same Text, the fourth Commandement, should signifie antiently one thing, and in our daies another thing, this is an absurdity matchlesse.

That by Sabbath, and seventh day the fourth Commandement should enjoyne the *Saturday* to the *Jews*, and the *Sunday* to the *Gentiles*; the Saturday for thousands of years unto Christ, and the Sunday for ever

ever after Christ]; this may well be called the *Queene* of absurdities.

Hath the approach of the *Gospell* changed the meaning of the words in the *Law*? If words in the *Decalogue* shall have one sense before Christ came, and another sense after Christs comming, there will be no certaine sense of any of the ten Commandements.

Were a *Schoolemaster* to construe *Terence*, or other profane Author to his Scholars, he would be ashamed to give any sense divers from an *ancient* known sense; but we have *Ministers* not ashamed to abuse their *Auditors* worse than a Schoolemaster would abuse his Schollers: wherefore Schoolemasters shall rise up in judgement to condemne such Ministers; God never bestowed wit and learning on such Ministers, and I may say *honestly* too, to corrupt his Scriptures, and to abuse their Auditors; Is this to take charge of the *Soules* of the people?

For my part, laying aside the respects I beare to *God*, and to the

Scriptures, I care not whether you keepe Saturday-Sabbath, Sunday-Sabbath, or Monday Sabbath; and if we kept none at all it were beſt of all: but if we have reſpect to God or to his Scriptures, let us give him the day of his own *choice*, not another; let us not ſo ſhamefully and abominably corrupt his Scriptures by notorious falſe expoſitions; it were far better for the Church and State to have no *Scriptures*, than to have Scriptures falſely expounded to the people.

The eighth Abſurdity

Suppoſe we that *Chriſt* had left a Commandement in the New Teſtament for the *Lords day*, as *certainly God* left a Commandement for *Saturday* the ſeventh day in the Old Teſtament; and ſuppoſe that *Chriſt* had ſaid, *Remember the Lords day to ſanctifie it; the firſt day of the weeke is the Lords day, in it thou ſhalt do no worke; for the Lord Chriſt reſted, or roſe from the dead on the firſt day of the weeke, and therefore the*

Lord

Lord Christ blessed the Lords day, and sanctified it.

If now Mr *Brabourne* should *preach* on this Commandement, or *write a book* for the true Exposition of it, and instruct the people of the Land, saying,

1. By the *Lords day*, you are to understand *a* Lords day, but not *the* Lords day, for every day of the weeke is the Lord Christs day in some sense. 2. By the *first day of the weeke* you may understand some *one day of the weeke* or other. 3. We may *imitate* Christs *resting* or rising from death, on the first day of the weeke, if we Christians rest upon some one or other day of the weeke, as on Saturday the last day of the weeke. 4. The Lords day was appointed to the *Grecians* in the first Age of the Church, but Saturday the seventh day to us Christians. 5. The Lords day, and first day of the weeke are not the *substance* of Christs Commandement, but Saturday the last of the weeke. 6 The Lords day, and first day of the weeke, are *indirectly* commanded by Christ,

but Saturday, the ſeventh day of the weeke, are *directly* commanded.

Should I thus expound this Commandement of Chriſt, oh, how would the *Patrons* of the Lords day rage, ſtampe, and ſtorme at me? Saying, how ſhamefully doth this *Brabourne* corrupt Chriſt his Law for the Lords day? How abominably doth he abuſe Gods people by his falſe Expoſitions? Never did *Jeſuite* ſo abuſe and corrupt any Texts of Scripture as this man hath abuſed our Lord Chriſt his Commandement; the *Devils* themſelves did never ſo abuſe the Scriptures; it is pitty the man is ſuffered to live any longer, hanging is too good for him, burne him like an Heretick, I cannot expreſſe the one halfe of their zeale in this kind; and I confeſſe all this were worthily ſpoken againſt me if I had ſo done; but now I pray *compare* my *ſuppoſed* Expoſition of Chriſts *ſuppoſed* Commandement with Mr *Cawdrie's reall* Expoſition of Gods reall fourth Commandement in the ſixe particulars mentioned, and behold how

how *paralell* and *alike* they are one to the other point by point! now if my Expoſition be abominably abſurd, what then is theirs? and if *Jeſuits*, yea, and the *Devill* never did the like, what may too many of our moſt *zealous Miniſters* thinke of themſelves who do the ſame dayly, and are the moſt forward and ſtirring in this kind of expoſition? ſo far of the Abſurdities, and now I come to my Concluſion.

The Concluſion.

HAving vindicated God's fourth Commandement from Mr *Cawdrie's* falſe Expoſitions of it; now it will be expected that I ſhould proceed in *anſwer* to other paſſages of his *Books*, and in particular to confute his anſwers made unto *divers* of my twenty foure Arguments for the *antient Sabbath*, and to anſwer or confute

his Texts alleaged by him in maintenance of the *Lords-day-Sabbath*, as it is called now adaies; touching these two I shall give this account.

First, concerning the *antient Sabbath*; if I should maintaine my twenty foure Arguments, Mr *Cawdry*, or some of his friends for him might complaine to the *State*, and procure my book to be answered by *fire* as Jewish; for so was Mr *Oekfords* book of like kind; but I am resolved that no provocations shall force me to proceed so far; againe, having vindicated the fourth Commandement from this false exposition of *one day in seven*, I have confuted the most of his *Answers* given by him to many of my 24 Arguments, so as it is needlesse for me

me to proceed any further.

Now as touching Mr *Cawdrie's* Texts, alledged by him to prove the *Lords day* to be kept for a Sabbath, if I ſhould anſwer them, as nothing is more facile and eaſie to be done, I might ſo alſo run the hazzard of having my books burnt with fire, but I will not offend the *State* ſo far; I ſhall therefore ſatisfie my ſelfe with this, that I have many yeares ſince diſcharged my *conſcience* by writing of two ſeverall books, wherein I have made anſwers plentifully to every one of their Texts of Scripture, and given not one but *many* anſwers unto *every* one of their Texts of Scripture, the which *anſwers were never yet confuted by any man*, and yet it is about twenty ſixe yeares ſince

I wrote my first book, and about twenty two yeares since I wrote my second booke; nor hath Mr *Cawdry* now confuted those answers, albeit he hath made a great flourish with three great books, saying, he will confute all *gainsayers*; but it is very false, for he hath not confuted Mr *Brabourne*./

I observe, that albeit M. *Cawdry* is larger upon the Sabbath than any man, yet hath he nothing *new*, or more for matter than others have wrote many yeares agone; *new books but old matter*; more *words*, but no more *matter*; the *Practice of Piety* in a few leaves is as large for matter as M. *Cawdries* three large books of twelve shillings price; now since Mr *Cawdry* hath brought no new *Texts* of Scripture to light, or

new,

new *Arguments* for the Lords day; wherefore should I blot paper, and spend inke to answer that in *him* which I have fully answered long since to *others*, who have wrote the same things before him?

Whilest I was in writing of my first booke of the Sabbath, and in answering the Texts of Scripture alledged for the *Lords day*, methought they were such *simple* and *silly* things for that purpose, as my thoughts often *checked* me for vouchsafing an answer to them, fearing understanding Divines would secretly thinke that *Brabourne* was some *Ignoramus*, or some vainglorious man, labouring to gaine credit by fighting with a *shaddow*, and confuting what no judicious Schollar would maintaine. I

remember that divers times I tooke off my Pen to pau'e whether I ſhould go on or not, and doubtleſſe I had then broke off, but that I ſaw ſo many of our moſt *zealous* Miniſters ſo far from being *aſhamed* of it, as they with a deale of hot zeale maintained it; but I may ſay of them, as once Saint *Paul* ſaid of thoſe ſuperſtitious Jews, *They have the zeale of God, but not according to knowledge*, Rom. 10.2. And as Chriſt ſaid to the Scribes and Phariſees, *Woe be unto you blind guides*, for miſleading the *devout* people of the Land, *Mat.* 23. and ſo I end.

FINIS.